

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **04 November 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Reed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,288 hereinafter “Reed”), and Bischoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,377 hereinafter “Bischoff”).

Amendments based on 8 January 2009 Phone Interview with Examiner

In a phone interview on 8 January 2009, Examiner suggested clarifying that the system in claim 1 includes hardware components. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 to clarify that the system includes a processor and a memory. Support for this amendment is found in instant application par. [0021].

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Examiner rejected 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 as being indefinite. Specifically it was not clear to Examiner whether the first or the second component is “capable of providing a viewer object that enables the third component to display transferred data associated with the DTSO’s data type.” Applicant has amended these claims by removing this phrase.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 as being unpatentable over Reed in view of Bischoff. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Neither Reed nor Bischoff disclose a universal data transfer interface that does **not** have a priori knowledge of the components’ domain specific file system domain or printer domain protocols.

Examiner asserts that Reed (Reed, C54:L28-49) discloses components that do not have a priori knowledge of each other’s domain specific interfaces and

protocols. However, these components are used to determine “the most preferred communication network available” (Reed, C54:L42-43).

Elsewhere, Reed discloses:

- communications objects that are “the primary data structure transmitted from the provider program to the consumer program to control communications between the provider and the consumer” (Reed, C17::L29-32).
- Structured data included in the communications objects that provide “the common ‘frame of reference’ necessary to automate communications operations between a provider and a consumer” (Reed, C18:L19-23).
- Communications objects that are acquired by a consumer, which enable the consumer to “use the appropriate encoding” (Reed, C51:L6-13).
- “Communications objects represent a transfer of communications intelligence...from a provider to a consumer who wishes to form a communications relationship with the provider” (Reed, C42:L50-53).
- Communications objects “automate data interchange with the provider of the object.”

Nowhere does Reed disclose that the communications objects include knowledge of the provider’s domain specific **file system domain** or **printer domain protocols**.

Bischoff discloses an “interface between the operations support system and each network element” (Bischoff, C2:L16-18), but is altogether silent on data transfer objects that provide domain specific **file system domain** or **printer domain protocols** from one component to another. In other words, Bischoff is silent on a universal data transfer interface that does **not** have a priori knowledge

of the components' domain specific **file system domain** or **printer domain** protocols.

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention involve a universal data transfer interface that does **not** have a priori knowledge of the components' domain specific **file system domain** or **printer domain** protocols (instant application, pars. [0003], [0005]-[0006], [0009], [0029]-[0030]).

Nothing within Reed or Bischoff, suggests or implies a universal data transfer interface that does **not** have a priori knowledge of the components' domain specific **file system domain** or **printer domain** protocols.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention involve the aforementioned features. These amendments find support in instant application, pars. [0003], [0005]-[0006], [0009], [0029]-[0030]. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-11, which depend upon claim 8, claims 14-18, which depend upon claim 12, claims 20-22, which depend upon claim 19, claims 25-29, which depend upon claim 23, and claims 31-33, which depend upon claim 30, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 30 January 2009

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com